Dear Jim, 1/28/75

Getting a 4 a.m. start to keep from getting farthur behind from having to go to dentist today. Thanks for your 1/24 and the enclosed goodies I've not yet had a chance to look at. And I did get the NYTimes 1/27.

Before I forget, WxPost cut the Anderson column 1/27 but not significantly. It weakened but did not change part and eliminated where it said this was the first of a series, as I was certain from knowledge of the story. I'd given it to Whitten in early November, then without success. I rather think that the use was not connected with me but with someone else I know, not known to you. The story stacks from the pre-Anderson investigation of which I know and depositions of which I have copies. I have had parts for a couple of years. No interest anywhere then.

Yesterday I got word from Memphis on the judge's anticipated decisions schedule and his intent to accomodate the major media. I suggested to JL that he tell Valentine. When Jim spoke to me later he told me he had, that the Post will probably fly Paul down to do their own story, and that Paul had noted JL had been checking some we-think CIA incorporation records in the District government files. How come? The Post got a tip from a woman claiming to have been part of the operations and PV was checking it out. We'll see if the Post uses the story. Pacific Engineering & Architecture Co., a proprietary, we think, from some earlier checking beginning with Continental News and Hunt(the other). We got into quite a nest of these from what I take to be CIA carelessness, using the same address and phone for them all...Seems that Continental was twice adjacent to my friend Dave Polland, first in Munsey Bldg, then when both moved to National Press Bldg. Jim thinks it may be innocent. I've done no personal checking, but my friend has not been very diligent in representing my interest with Fried et al.

As you will agther, Goulden did an ax job on all of us. I haven't seen the piece yet. I'm a bit surprised but it is conducive to some arithmetic.Some of what he says of me that comes from neither the interview nor my writing of speaking is what Bud says, but Bud denied to Jim having said it and Jim believes him. He also claims that on part Goulden broke confidence. Some of the worst of what Goulden quotes him as saying he did not deny. Goulden didn't even speak to Lesar, of whom he says other than I did and not what I did. The question remains "why?" The timing is interesting: why did he and The Washingtonian go for such an ax job at this time? The concept seems to have come after the Ray hearing and after I was pushing JL to get to some of my suits, the latter often by phone.

Your reasoning is sound on the parts of the chicken. We'll have to wait and see. I can confirm from other things, too many, the ego need of which you speak. And it is quite difficult for me to be satisfied with completely innocent explanations of some of the things not done to which I've often enough made reference in the past. They were serious errors. I do know of previous connections but they are not necessarily of the kind imputed. Nor are they necessarily not that kind. They can be.

Lesar has no recollection of the article we both do not have. I think another possible explanation is a typo in the letter we saw. Or perhaps a late edition use only. As I think back, this guy's writings does fit with the current campaign which I've thought served the interest of what I regard as his faction. It could be considered the earliest chords of the orchestration, especially his gping after Superman. Some source provided him for it what is not readily available. All of this followed his unloading on Der K. And Der K had been after the non-spooks of that faction, had eliminated part of their work. Wrongfully, I think.

I'll make an overall note separately on the overall story.

After I knew we had won in the Supreme Court on the discovery precedent (to me a foregone conclusion because it was the worst case the government(s) could have taken there) I made a couple of efforts to attract interest to what I believe is a natural feature story: young lawyer, first real case, sets precedent. One of these was to Eason. He did air me nriefly on this. Our communication was not too good, oerhaps my fault. Perhaps I assumed too much knowledge. He did use the occasion to recall that they had been mentioning WW IV and how was it that people could get it and at what price? I said. The way he did it led me to believe that he and Spann are under wraps. Not hearing from either on that content isoinconsistent with the records and interests of both.

On your agreement that the name of the grandfather is consistent with the Leigh alias being one of Hunt's unknown ones, would you please consider another possibility in terms of what you can recollect of what you read: is the content such that he could have enjoyed doing the book more than he did the others and thus did a better job? Some of his earlier writing, for example, is much better than what he turned out when he was boiling pots. And while there seems to have been no need for his hiding this moonlighting from the CIA, I suppose it is also possible that there are times when doing that might have seemed expedient. Helms seems to have been Gung Ho! for what he wrote. Perhaps others were not or he thought might not be. The sheer volume is consistent with the CIA subsidizing him to do it. And having read his own account of his own career, it is singularly skimpy. This is to say that he accounts for remarkably little real intelligence work for all those years of which he boasts so much.

The DC library has other Leigh books. Lesar is skimming.

He has established an interesting Weybright connection, with a publisher who has known connections. I'll be learning more when I get copies of his notes.

Going back to your agreement that little new seems to be emerging, let me add two things: more easily could and hasn't and this and more would have come out several years ago if there had not been widespread refusal to touch any of it. I have written some of this and offered it to many. Off the top, with variations in the nature of the offer but in no case not one that would not have led to fuller disclosures:

All TV nets, including PBS through NPACT (with IV); WxPost, LATimes, Time, Newsweek, AFL/CIO, Knight papers, Mollenhoff, London Sunday Times, and quite a number on Capitol Hill.

Hersh did not phone yesterday. He should have had my letter in time to. I did not expect him to and had not written a conciliatory letter.

What he did do is sick. He tried to check Roffman out with George O'Toole, of the PSE jazz. O'Toole is suddenly an expert on the JFK assassination? Because he is a former CIAer? What other expertise can Hersh attribute to him?

Naturally, O'Toole, who has done no real work, had never heard of Howard. So he asked Bud about him. From Bud he learned only that Howard is "some kid in school." Not that Bud could not have been more informative. Not that he does not know of my relationship with Howard. Bud also does not like Howard's strong reaction to a very sick appearance Bud and Sprague made jointly at the Unix. Penna.

What it any influence this has on Hersh and the solid material on Belin we'll see.

But it was not the way to be helpful to Hersh or to getting the Belin story out.

What Bud told Jim he had told Goulden about me is that we have personality differences but on fact and analysis he has never known me to be wrong and knows of nobody who dependability or work can be compared with mine. This is a somewhat higher recommendation than I have ever known him to offer. I do think it is not impossible today. I think it is more likely that Bud was much stronger than "personality differences." More like I can't stand the arrogant son-of-a-bitch.

That the Goulden/Washingtonian interest coincides with the beginning of the breaking of the CIA story and follows upon Szulc's clobbering of Kissinger is a provocative coincidence. Both are contributing editors of The Washingtonian.

Evaluation of Marchetti's book: he does not intend uncovering all that is possible. This is consistent with his belief that there is a need for an intelligence agency but not its excesses. Well, he manages not to give the address of the CIA's downtown office for the domestic-intelligence operation. He knew it. I checked it with him. The odd thing is that I had forgotten that Wise & Ross (Wise at least officed in the same building then) gave it years ago. I thus went to much work to figure it out (accurately, further than W & R did). I thus find omission of this specific interesting.

Best,